



City of Loma Linda Official Report

Floyd Petersen, Mayor
Stan Brauer, Mayor pro tempore
Robert Christman, Councilmember
Robert Ziprick, Councilmember
Charles Umeda, Councilmember

COUNCIL AGENDA: May 23, 2006
TO: City Council
VIA: Dennis R. Halloway, City Manager
FROM: Pamela Byrnes-O'Camb, City Clerk *ptb*
SUBJECT: Minutes of February 21, February 28, and March 14, 2006

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council approve the Minutes of February 21, February 28, and March 14, 2006.

City of Loma Linda

City Council Minutes

Special Meeting of February 21, 2006

A special meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 6:03 p.m., Tuesday, February 21, 2006, in the City Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:

Mayor Floyd Petersen
Robert H. Christman
Robert Ziprick
Charles Umeda

Councilman Absent:

Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer

Others Present:

City Manager Dennis R. Holloway
City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

No items were added or deleted, nor were any public participation comments offered upon invitation of the Mayor.

Michael Christianson, Planning Commission Chairman; James Shipp, Historical Commission Chairman; Robert Fitzsimmons, Budget Committee Chairman; Kurt Swigart, Parks, Recreation, Beautification Committee Chairman; Lauren Popescu, Traffic Advisory Committee Member; and George Pendered, Budget Committee Member also were present.

CC-2006-032 – General Plan and Residential and Hillside Development Control Measure (Proposed Initiative) City Council discussion and direction to Staff and City Committees/Commissions (budget Committee; Historical Commission; Parks, Recreation, Beautification Committee; Planning commission; Traffic Advisory Committee; and Trails Development Committee) to review and make recommendations regarding the General Plan, and Hillside Development Control Measure (Proposed Initiative); Schedule Workshop

Mayor Petersen introduced the item, stating that on February 14, presentations were made regarding the General Plan and how it would impact the South Hills. The presentations were confusing to many citizens. He elaborated that the City spent funds to update the General Plan, including but not limited to consultants, Environmental Impact Report, and Traffic Analysis in order to draft the General Plan Update so that it complied with State Law and would provide the City with guidance over the next 20 years. In doing so, over 30 public hearings were held and changes were made in response to public input; He also stated that General Plan Amendments are allowed to modify a document when necessary.

He went on to say that the Save Loma Linda Group presented a General Plan that had no public input, but rather was drafted by a few individuals without the benefit of the various required studies.

Mayor Petersen stated that he requested this meeting to ask the City Council to commission the committees and commissions of the City to meet, to review the documents relating to impacts and what each purports to do, and return recommendations to the City Council for consideration. He explained that because committee/commission members represent a broad segment of the community, broad consensus could be reached.

Councilman Christman commented that the proposed initiative covered not only the South Hills, but streets, heights of buildings, traffic and other matters. The previous initiative approved by the voters was very narrow in scope in that it addressed only the hillsides; however, it had unintended consequences. Working with the authors, another initiative was approved by the voters that solved some of the problems. He stated his opposition to running a government by initiative because of the massive unintended consequences. He elaborated that the proposed initiative basically changed how the City operated and would set the stage for major lawsuits.

Councilman Umeda suggested that the committees/commissions review 1) Staff's Draft General Plan; 2) the proposal submitted by Glenn Elssmann and Jonathan Zirkle; and 3) the Save Loma Linda version and submit their recommendations; that the committees/commissions not draft another version.

He went on to say that there is support for low density in the hills and preserving open space; however, there were also negative consequences relating to the requirement to meet affordable housing mandates, park development, and zoning in general in that the City is mandated to zone to accommodate a certain number of homes, as its regional share, in approximately five-to-seven-year increments. As an example, the allocation for the period of 1998 to 2005 was 1500 homes. Another allocation was expected in 2007. If the City did not meet its allocations, consequences could be imposed that the City would have no control over until it met the requirements. Therefore, the City must prepare to meet its allocations through the General Plan and zoning.

City Council Minutes
February 21, 2006
Page 2

Councilman Ziprick suggested that a joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission also be held, and suggested February 28.

Councilman Umeda stated that agreement concerning the South Hills, the maximum number of houses, and density was important so that drastic measures to comply with housing allocations would not be necessary.

James Shipp, Historical Commission Chairman; Michael Christianson, Planning Commission Chairman; Kurt Swigart, Parks Recreation and Beautification Committee Chairman; and Lauren Popescu, Traffic Advisory Committee member, asked about General Plan Amendments, the Housing Element, how the various Elements of the General Plan were compatible, and what the differences were between the initiative and the City's Draft General Plan. It was also suggested that the differences in the various presentations be outlined; that the Trails Committee review the various versions relating to the South Hills due to open space and trail issues; that subsequently the other committees/commissions conduct their review and formulate recommendations; and that the Traffic Advisory Committee also review the proposed alternatives.

Ovidiu Popescu stated that the Save Loma Linda Group was agreeable to meet with the Trails Committee to present the hillside portion of the initiative, but didn't consider being part of the proposed workshop.

Mayor Petersen reiterated that the City Council was requesting all committees/commissions to participate in the workshop as well as those presenting alternatives to the City's Draft General Plan Update; i.e., the Save Loma Linda Group, Glenn Elssmann and Jonathan Zirkle.

Councilman Umeda suggested that proponents of the alternatives presented to the City Council were members of various committees; that those individuals who had taken public positions or were part of a group endorsing one position or another, recuse themselves from deliberation or formulating recommendations.

Glenn Elssmann expressed appreciation for the workshop regarding the alternatives.

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and carried to schedule a workshop with City Committees/Commissions at 9:00 a.m., Sunday, March 12, and that those who took public positions or were part of a group endorsing a position, participate in the discussion, but not vote relating to recommendations. Mayor pro tempore Brauer absent.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda
City Council Minutes

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Regular Meeting of February 28, 2006

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 28, 2006, in the City Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:	Mayor Floyd Petersen Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer Robert H. Christman Robert Ziprick Charles Umeda
Councilman Absent:	None
Others Present:	City Manager Dennis R. Halloway City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

Councilman Umeda led the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. No items were added or deleted nor were any public participation comments offered upon invitation of the Mayor.

Conflict of Interest

Mayor pro tempore Brauer declared a possible conflict of interest on Items relating to hillside development due to property ownership. Mayor Petersen and Councilman Ziprick declared possible conflicts of interest relating to the LUAHSC exemption in Save Loma Linda's proposed Initiative. It was noted that Mayor pro tempore Brauer had previously declared a possible conflict of interest relating to the LUAHSC exemption; the Rule of Necessity was implemented resulting in Mayor pro tempore Brauer sitting to constitute a quorum and voting relating to the LUAHSC exemption item. (Conflicts of interest pertain to Minute Item 2006-038.)

Oral Reports

Mayor Petersen announced that Councilman Christman's son was serving in Iraq, that he had spoken to him recently via satellite.

Scheduled and Related Items

CC-2006-033 - Presentation by Kim Patrick and Michelle Parker of the Inland Empire Safe Kids Coalition regarding National Child Passenger Safety Week

Ms. Patrick and Ms. Parker shared the events that took place during National Child Passenger Safety Week, February 12-18, 2006 in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. They also stated that the Coalition supported Assembly Bill 2108, which would raise the standard of California regarding child passenger safety to require children up to eight years of age to be fastened in a booster seat when in an automobile.

CC-2006-034 - Presentation by representative of American Cancer Society regarding Relay for Life

The representative was not present; however, Mayor Petersen stated that the Relay for Life was scheduled to take place in June at the Leonard Bailey Park.

The City Council recessed at 7:09 p.m. to allow a public hearing scheduled for Redevelopment Agency consideration to occur and reconvened at 7:24 p.m. with all members present.

CC-2006-035 - Public Hearing - Council Bill #R-2006-08 - Determining costs related to the Fall 2005 Weed Abatement Program

The public hearing was opened and Fire Marshal Crawford presented the report into evidence, noting that the Program addressed properties considered to be fire hazards pursuant to the stipulations in the Uniform Fire Code. He reported that property owners of record had an opportunity to protest the notice mailed prior to the abatement work; subsequent to the City's contractor completing the work, invoices are sent to the property owners of record and they then have an opportunity to protest the charges. Fire Prevention Inspector Patterson distributed an updated summary of costs. He also distributed a letter from Hazel Church pertaining to Parcel No. 0283-092-46. No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed. The City Council reviewed the letter from Mrs. Church.

Motion by Brauer, seconded by Christman and unanimously carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2006-08 with the amended exhibit as presented, including the charges pertaining to APN 0283-092-46.

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Resolution No. 2434

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda adopting a Report and Statement of Expenses for the Fall 2005 Weed Abatement Program and imposing a lien upon property for payment therefore

CC-2006-036 – Public Hearing – Appeal of Planning Commission decision to deny a request to demolish two existing homes and to build 12 two-bedroom apartments on .52 acres located at 10684-10690 Ohio Street in the North Central Neighborhood in an R-3, Multiple Family Residential Zone (To be Continued to May 9)

- a. General Plan Amendment no. 04-07 – from Medium Density 5-10 du/acre to Very High Density 11-20 du/acre
- b. Variance No. 05-02 to encroach into front yard setback for a structure and parking space
- c. Precise Plan of Design No. 04-15
- d. Development Agreement to provide three affordable units (1 very low income and 2 low income in addition to giving relocation priority to the Agency)

The public hearing was opened. Mayor Petersen stated that the public hearing was to be continued to May 9; however, anyone unable to attend May 9 could provide testimony at this time. No public testimony was offered.

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to continue the public hearing to May 9.

CC-2006-037 – Public Hearing – Appeal of Planning Commission decision to deny a request to demolish one single-family home and accessory structure at 26657 Orange Avenue and to build 30 single-family homes on a three-acre project site located at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue at New Jersey Street (To be Continued to May 9)

- a. General Plan Amendment 04-03 to amend the General Plan from no designation to mixed use
- b. Zone Change 04-03 to amend the Zoning Map from Administrative Professional to Planned Community
- c. Tentative Tract Map 16811 to subdivide three acres into 30 single-family small lots with a central park.
- d. Precise Plan of Design 04-04
- e. Development Agreement relating to affordable housing

Mayor Petersen opened the public hearing, stating that the public hearing was to be continued to May 9; however, anyone unable to attend May 9 could provide testimony at this time. No public testimony was offered.

Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to continue the public hearing to May 9.

CC-2006-038 – Public Hearing – Council Bill #O-2006-01 (Second reading/Roll call) – Amending Section 2.12.020 of the Municipal Code pertaining to salary for Councilmen

Mayor Petersen opened the public hearing. The City Clerk presented the report into evidence, stating that City Council had not increased its salary of \$377.13 per month since 1992; City Council salary was regulated by the Government Code and if the City were to adopt the proposed Ordinance, the salary would increase to \$711.13 upon the seating of the new City Council Members subsequent to the June 6 election. No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Brauer, seconded by Christman and unanimously carried to waive reading of Council Bill #O-2006-01 in its entirety; direct the Clerk to read by title only; and adopt on roll call vote.

The Clerk read the title and called the roll with the following results:

Ayes: Petersen, Brauer, Christman, Ziprick, Umeda
Noes: None
Absent: None

Ordinance No. 652

An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda amending Section 2.2.020 of the Municipal Code pertaining to salary for councilmen

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

CC-2006-039 – Comments pertaining to presentations on February 14, 2006 regarding the proposed Initiative as it relates to the Land Use Element of General Plan and other issues related to the General Plan

- a. Save Loma Linda
- b. Jonathan Zirkle
- c. Councilman Umeda

Note: Throughout the presentations, Mayor Petersen, Mayor pro tempore Brauer and Councilman Ziprick left the Council Chamber during discussion of potential conflict of interest topics as stated previously. Mayor Petersen and Mayor pro tempore Brauer chaired the item, based on the content of the discussion.

Mayor Petersen commented that on February 14 several hours of presentation relating to the subject item was provided. On February 21, the City Council asked the Committees and Commissions to review the issues at a workshop scheduled for March 12. The proposed General Plan had the benefit of at least 30 public hearings over four years, and has not been finalized; however, when adopted, would reflect the work and comments of the City Council, Staff, advisors, consultants, and public input. Even upon adoption, the document may contain unintended consequences that would then need modification through the amendment process.

The proposed Initiative was drafted by a few with little or no public input; was a complex document and would also contain unintended consequences.

He then stated that on February 14, due to the lateness of the hour, Councilman Umeda did not complete his presentation.

Councilman Umeda indicated that he had addressed issues involving traffic; however, the issue pertaining to the Loma Linda University Medical Center and Loma Linda University exemption contained in the Initiative relating to traffic mitigation levels had not been addressed. He went on to say that Ms. Biggs, counsel for Save Loma Linda, recently submitted a letter.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, stated that Julie Biggs, Counsel for Save Loma Linda, attended the February 14 meeting to respond to questions; however, she could not be present this evening due to a conflict, so she answered questions posed at the last hearing by way of a letter. She indicated that copies of the letter would be distributed to the press and public and would be posted on the Save Loma Linda Website.

Councilman Umeda suggested that the responses offered by Ms. Biggs were inadequate in that no case law was cited that had been passed by the Supreme Court of the United States or California to address issues of equal protection and separation of church and state. He anticipated legal arguments from those affected by the Initiative.

Mrs. Glendrange indicated that Save Loma Linda hired three experienced law firms to review the Initiative and to provide advice. She then referred to the letter for legal answers.

Councilman Umeda stated that he could provide case law and standards that the courts used to review constitutional issues, and that he raised these issues because if the Initiative became law, lawsuits would result that would impact the City because of its Adventist history and the Initiative exempting only one institution, an Adventist institution. He elaborated that in the cases he researched involving the separation of church and state, it was the Religious Liberties Department of the General Conference that filed briefs and Amicus Curiae that opposed certain benefits conferred on religious institutions. He noted the importance of the legal ramifications if a religious institution was exempted while standards were applied to other property owners, retailers, and businesses in a stricter manner. If the Initiative passed, Loma Linda University Medical Center and Loma Linda University would receive a financial benefit from the exemption, while raising public relation and legal issues for the institutions.

Robert Frost of the Loma Linda University Foundation stated that he was not aware of any Loma Linda University Institutions requesting the exemption, nor was there any institutional support for it; to his knowledge, legal counsel had not reviewed the proposed Initiative. Councilman Umeda asked that the City be provided with a copy of any opinion relating to this issue that LLUMC/LLU counsel provided.

Mrs. Glendrange indicated that no member of Save Loma Linda contacted LLUAHSC about the exemption. To her knowledge, the institutions were not aware of the exemption. Her reasons for the exemption were as follows: LLUAHSC has been the heart of the community for decades; served as a medical health care and educational facility as well as providing employment in the city and the region; the institutions contribute to the quality of life in the community; they are part of what makes Loma Linda special; they put Loma Linda on the map, resulting in economic, quality of life and public health and safety issues for the community.

She elaborated that the subject Initiative was substantially similar to the Initiative in Redlands. It was also similar to the 1996 Hillside Initiative. The City of Redlands had not been sued. Loma Linda was not sued

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

on the 1996 Initiative. The exemption for LLUAHSC was not given because of the religious affiliation; it was incidental that LLUMC and LLU were Adventist institutions. The exemption did not support or promote the Seventh-day Adventist Church. She added that the Initiative did not demand that the City Council ask LLUAHSC to maintain levels of service; however, the City Council could still require LLUAHSC to maintain the same levels of service as other developers.

Councilman Umeda reviewed his analysis of the problems he saw on a constitutional basis, noting that the Initiative stated that, projects where sufficient mitigation to achieve the above-stated objectives was infeasible shall not be approved unless/until sufficient mitigation measures were identified and implemented, which would apply stricter traffic levels of service on commercial, retail, and residential development. Mrs. Glendrange confirmed that it would apply to all new development projects, except those that were exempt.

He also stated that small infill lots and small developments were exempted. The Initiative also stated that development projects that directly furthered the primary institutional purpose of Loma Linda University Adventist Health Service Centers and/or related entities or subsidiaries were exempt from the traffic level of service requirements except as to those related to the hillside preservation areas, the hillside conservation area and expanded hillside area; the building height requirement and the maximum allowable residential densities except for those set forth for the hillside conservation area and the hillside preservation area so long as such development projects were either nonresidential in character or provided only student or staff housing for those exempt entities.

Mrs. Glendrange confirmed that LLUAHSC was exempt from the traffic level of service requirements, but were not exempt from every mitigation requirement in the Initiative in that there was a clause that referred to development fees. She referred to the Initiative, stating that all developers were to pay development fees to cover 100 percent of their pro-rata share of the cost of any public infrastructure, facilities or services including roads, sewer, utility, police and fire services, necessitated as a result of approving the development.

Councilman Umeda countered that the Initiative in the City of Redlands exempted a class of institutions, such as all non-profits. The exemption in the Save Loma Linda Initiative pertained to one institution.

City Attorney Holdaway responded to concerns expressed by Councilman Umeda, stating that he had not prepared a formal opinion, but it was apparent that there was a severe equal protection issue with the Initiative. The religious institution involved was also an issue of significant concern. He indicated that if requested, he would provide a formal opinion. Referring to the letter from Ms. Biggs, he noted that there was no legal authority cited for the arguments made on legal protection issues. He noted that also worthy of consideration was that if the exemption for the Medical Center were found to be invalid, on equal protection or other grounds, then the entire Initiative would apply to the Medical Center and all related institutions. Application to all related LLU institutions may be one of the unintended consequences referred to by Mayor Petersen earlier that the drafters of the Initiative wished to avoid and went through some effort to exclude application of the Initiative to those institutions. But if their efforts to do that failed, then the institutions would clearly be subject to the entire Initiative and the affect of the Initiative on the institutions and their plans would certainly warrant consideration.

Councilman Umeda commented that there was a stricter standard within the California Constitution that specifically prohibited any government body from providing any aid whatsoever to a specific religious institution. Ms. Bigg's letter did not address that separation of church and state issue, which raised questions about the legal foundation for the exemption.

Councilman Christman indicated he would not support an Initiative that would put the City at high risk. In response to questions, Mrs. Glendrange stated that the law firms of Worden & Williams, which drafted the 1993 and 1996 Initiatives; Chatten-Brown & Associates Los Angeles; and Burke Williams and Sorenson in Riverside reviewed the Initiative.

Mayor pro tempore Brauer commented that the City Council was obligated to get as much information to the public as possible; including legal implications.

Councilman Umeda stated that he had concerns about the hillside portion of the Initiative and housing. He showed the current General Plan Land Use Element Map and asked Mrs. Glendrange to show the densities proposed by the Initiative. She stated that the Initiative designated all of the City-owned land as open space non-commercial, recreational open space with no residential development permitted; 350 acres of the City's land could be traded to obtain other more highly valued open space areas, such as Scott Canyon; the Initiative provided that the City Council set the density if land was traded so other land owners could be incentivized to trade high valued areas. The Initiative retained the current land use designation in the Initiative area identified as Rural Estates (one unit per acre); retained the 1996 Hillside densities except for the City's land; and San Bernardino County zoning density and land use was applied to certain areas (one house per five acres and one house per 10 acres).

He questioned affordability of houses in the hillside area, considering the densities proposed by the Initiative; setting aside approximately 3000 acres as open space, and what within the proposed growth

management plan provided housing for working class families within the city. Mrs. Glendrange stated that there was no affordable housing planned for the hills. She also stated that densities of up to 5 units per acre were allowed, aside from the hillside and San Timoteo Creek areas; however under the Initiative, densities would be limited by lot size for single-family houses, maximum building height, and level of service requirements for traffic. The Initiative was silent as to location of affordable housing.

Councilman Umeda commented on the Regional Housing Needs Allocation administered by the State Department of Housing and Community Development, which addressed housing for all ranges of economic status, and asked how the Initiative provided for meeting the City's allocation. Mrs. Glendrange responded that Save Loma Linda did not oppose apartments and condominiums, but opposed the number of units as well as single-family homes on small lots rather than 7,200 square-foot lots.

Councilman Christman stated that the Initiative was vague and completely altered the way government in Loma Linda operated and suggested that the City Council defer further consideration until the Committees and Commissions met and submitted comments. Those commenting on development or non-development in the South Hills had a vested interest; there had been little comment from others.

The City Council recessed at 9:20 p.m. and reconvened at 9:30 p.m. with all members present.

Those speaking were John Mirau, 1806 Orange Tree Lane, Redlands; John Greenwood, Associate Professor at LLU Dental; Dan Kunihiro, 25522 Allen Way; Stewart Albertson, 25965 Reed Way; Richard Kunihiro, 26433 Margarita Lane; Ovi Popescu, 25523 State Street; Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road; and Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive. A summary of comments is as follows:

1. Measure U in Redlands resulted in 8 lawsuits over 10 years costing the City of Redlands approximately \$2-\$3 million in legal fees.
2. There were two follow up Initiatives to define what Measure U meant because of the vague language.
3. The slow growth Initiative group didn't believe the City Council was properly implementing Measure U, so lawsuits were filed.
4. The State Legislature intervened and during the process the City of Redlands lost approximately \$10 million of sales tax revenue due to delay of projects.
5. The projects are now very successful.
6. Loma Linda should not model its General Plan after Measure U of Redlands.
7. Save Loma Linda exempted LLUMC and LLU from traffic level of service to avoid opposition from the main employer in the City.
8. LLUMC and LLU have been placed in a difficult position regarding separation of church and state.
9. The City Council has dealt fairly with issues related to the Initiative proposed by the Save Loma Linda group.
10. In-depth scrutiny of the Initiative revealed numerous flaws and unintended consequences as it is currently written.
11. It is an elitist position to demand 7,200 square foot lots.
12. The Orchard Park Project proposed to provide diversity in housing with approximately 40 percent of the single-family homes placed on 7,200 square-foot lots or larger.
13. Commercial and retail require a backdrop of residential to support the uses.
14. By planning the 308 acres encompassing the Orchard Park and University Village Specific Plans, an interactive residential and commercial community is created with an elementary and middle school.
15. Requiring 7,200 square foot lots forces urban sprawl.
16. The Initiative would not allow University Village and Orchard Park's creative design of connected parks and open space.
17. Building standards should not be based on personal preferences.
18. Equal protection was not discussed at the meetings with the law firm of Chatten-Brown,
19. The meetings with Chatten-Brown resulted in a plan drafted by Jonathan Zirkle, City Committees, and others.
20. A minimum of 7,200 square foot lot size would result in fewer single-family homes because of the cost.
21. Regional housing requirements are based upon land inventory.

In light of the workshop with committees and the opportunity for comments at that time from other groups, Mrs. Glendrange was given the opportunity to offer rebuttal comments to Mr. Zirkle's earlier presentation and to comments made this evening. They are as follows:

1. One of the attorneys who assisted in writing Measure U stated that the development community had not sued on Measure U.
2. Enforcing a minimum lot size of 7200 square feet did not prevent modestly priced housing.
3. Approximately one-third of housing in Loma Linda is on lots smaller than 7200 square feet.
4. Bringing high-density housing projects causes congestion and doesn't help to relieve it.
5. It is elitist to say that current residents have 7200 square-foot lots, but buyers of future homes, will have smaller lots.

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

6. Chatten-Brown Brown did not endorse Mr. Zirkle's plans as was stated, but specifically recommended avoidance of that plan; retaining the 1996 hillside Initiative in tact, and including more areas of the hills for protection. The proposed Initiative does that.

7. Ms. Biggs addressed Mr. Zirkle's presentation in her letter, which is on the Save Loma Linda Website.

8. The maximum number of houses in the hills would be 1250 with or without the Initiative.

9. The Initiative omits about 750 acres on the west end.

10. Traffic provisions of the Initiative would not allow 3400 units on the west end.

11. The Initiative protects the natural hillside areas and ridgelines on the west end because it says, "New development shall only be approved if it preserves scenic vistas of natural hillside areas and ridgelines which are visible except for manmade obstructions such as buildings or houses from north of Barton, I-10, or east of San Timoteo Canyon Road."

12. Save Loma Linda has engaged in this effort because the current City Council has declined to listen to the concerns of the community that high-density growth will negatively affect the quality of life in our city.

Councilman Umeda countered that commercial development generates more daily trips. As an example, the EIR of the Orchard Park and University Village developments shows that the Orchard Park development, which has fewer units than University Village but more commercial development, actually generates more daily trips than University Village, which has more residential units than Orchard Park.

Councilman Ziprick countered that the proposal presented by Jonathan Zirkle preserved more open space because the proposed Initiative excluded about 350 acres to the southwest.

Glenn Elssmann, 25814 Business Center Drive, commented that the Initiative made three representations: 1) It will be the item that saves the hills; 2) Solves or prevents the traffic problem; 3) Make the developers pay. He went on to say that there was a plan that would save more hillside areas than the Initiative and would not use the land the city purchased for open space. The University Village and Orchard Park EIR showed that if the projects were not developed, traffic would worsen because the mitigation provided by the projects would provide an adequate level of service for traffic; however, neither project could resolve current traffic issues. All projects approved by the City Council are required to pay a pro-rata share toward mitigation measures, improvements, and impacts of projects. Development Impact Fees have been raised substantially. Tremendous goals and objectives can be reached by working with property owners. Not addressing housing requirements placed on the community is serious. The institutions have grown significantly and are planning future growth. Significant compromises have been made on key issues regarding the hills.

Mayor Petersen stated that the workshop was scheduled for Sunday. Councilman Umeda stated that representatives of the State Department of Housing and Community Development were invited to conduct a workshop presentation on March 14. The workshop would include the City's responsibilities under Housing Development Law to provide a wide spectrum of housing for different income groups and the potential allocations to be applied to the City.

Councilman Ziprick commented that the proposal of Mr. Zirkle and Mr. Elssmann proposed that all of the City-owned land in the hills be dedicated as permanent open space; that all the land the City acquires through density transfers and any other means be added as permanent open space, which would approximate 3,000 acres; however, Save Loma Linda did not accept that proposal. The only areas that would allow development per the Elssmann and Zirkle proposal would be the far eastern and western portions of the hills. He also indicated that Mr. Elssmann, Mr. Zirkle, Save Loma Linda as well as individual Council Members met several times and reached consensus on several issues. He and Councilman Umeda would like the public to know where consensus was reached and what issues were still outstanding and perhaps that could be accomplished at the Sunday workshop.

Mayor Petersen suggested that the City Council submit an Initiative to the voters that would be narrow in scope, save in perpetuity all of the land that the City owned or would acquire in the hills as open space and would also set a cap on development in the hills.

Councilman Christman commented that the City Council purchased several hundred acres in order to preserve the hills. No Initiative should be proposed until the General Plan Update is adopted.

Mayor pro tempore Brauer commented on the Initiative in general, stating that decisions are sometimes made on personality that may not objectively be the manner in which decisions should be made. It appeared that the two sides have become extremely polarized. Measure U did have negative consequences for the community. He was hopeful that the workshop would bring forth issues yet to be resolved and not involve personality issues.

Councilman Umeda expressed hope that consensus would be reached among the interested parties that the City Council could support; and if necessary, put it before a vote of the people as an Initiative so that the community would have a sense of security regarding future changes. Unfortunately, it appeared to be a personal battle of which plan was going to win, which lessened the opportunity for compromise. Referring

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

the various plans to the Committees whose interests are focused on what is best for the community was the right thing to do.

No action required.

CC-2006-040 – Consent Calendar

Motion by Christman, seconded by Ziprick and unanimously carried to approve the following items:

The Demands Register dated February 28, 2006 with commercial demands totaling \$710,487.33 and payroll demands totaling \$186,233.18.

The January 2006 Fire Department Stats Report for filing.

Award contract for Utility Billing Printing Services to InfoSend, Inc. for \$14,070.

Award contract for construction of the utility building at the Corporation Yard as follows: grading and concrete slab to Avila Construction, Inc. for \$88,400; electrical system to David-Richards Electric, Inc. for \$26,212; erection of the building to Mountain View Builders Inc. for \$16,800; installation of the fire sprinkler system to Alternative Fire Protection for \$7,300; placement of conduit to Griffin Construction, Inc., for \$3,405; and materials testing to Cal-West Consultants for \$2,000.

Award contract for sewer improvements on Seamount Drive by Open Cut and Pipe Bursting Methods to MCC Equipment Rentals Inc. of Yucaipa for \$170,355 with a contingency allocation of \$17,000; construction inspection and material testing services to Cal-West Consultants in an amount not to exceed \$23,000; construction survey to Joseph E. Bonadiman and Associates, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$5,000.

Award contract for re-roofing of the Civic Center, Fire Station, Library, and Senior Center to Commercial Roofing Systems, Inc. of Arcadia in the amount of \$394,872.14; a contingency allocation of \$20,000; and an additional expenditure of \$351,321.72 to purchase the materials necessary for the subject project.

Council Bill #R-2006-09.

Resolution No. 2435

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda, certifying that the City of Loma Linda has the resources to fund the projects submitted for inclusion in the FY 2007/2008-2011/2012 Transportation Improvement Program and affirming its commitment to implement all of the projects submitted in the Program

Execution of an agreement with the Franchise Tax Board (Agreement No. C0525180) pursuant to the Local Government Sharing Program (AB 63).

Council Bill #R-2006-10.

Resolution No. 2436

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda adopting the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the E Street Transit Corridor and Transit Supportive Uses adjacent to the LPA Stations

Council Bill #R-2006-11.

Resolution No. 2437

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda approving and authorizing the execution of an Agreement for the acquisition of property from Plaza Mini Storage for the widening of the Mountain View Overcrossing

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Old Business

CC-2006-041 – General Plan Update (To be Continued to April 18)

- a. Adopt and Approve the Findings for Statements of Overriding Considerations (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15043, 15091, 15092, and 15093) for the significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to Air Quality, Loss of Open Space, Biological Resources, Water Supply, and Traffic and Circulation that would result from implementation of the General Plan (October 2005)
- b. Council Bill #R-2005-55 – Approve and Certify the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which includes the Draft EIR, Response to Comments, and Mitigation Monitoring Program based on the Findings
- c. Council Bill #R-2005-57 – Approve and Adopt all Elements of the Drft General Plan (October 2005), as follows:
 1. Introduction to the General Plan Elements (Element 1.0)
 2. Land Use Element (Element 2.o) including consideration of
 - a. Proposed Initiative
 - b. Proposed Alternative to the South Hills Designation (Alternative 2)
 - c. December 6, 2005 proposed South Hills Designation (Alternative 3)
 3. Community design Element (Element 3.0)
 4. Economic Development Element (Element 4.0)
 5. Housing Element (Element 7.0)
 6. Transportation and Circulation Element (Element 6.0)
 7. Noise Element (Element 7.0)
 8. Public Services and Facilities Element (Element 8.0)
 9. Conservation and Open Space Element (Element 9.0)
 10. Public Health and Safety Element (Element 10.0)
 11. General Plan Implementation Programs Element (Element 11.0)

Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Brauer and unanimously carried to continue the item to April 18.

New Business

CC-2006-042 – Authorize repair of Council Chamber T.V. broadcast sound system

Motion by Christman, seconded by Umeda and unanimously carried to authorize repair of the Council Chamber T.V. broadcast sound system by City Electronics in an amount not to exceed \$12,000.

Reports of Councilmen

Mayor Petersen commented on the Redflex cameras and the positive comments he had received.

Mayor pro tempore Brauer commented on the billboards at the 215 freeway and asked that the City Council send letters to the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors and the City of Colton to look at a constructive plan of action to remove the billboards, and requested it be placed on a future agenda.

Councilman Umeda commented on traffic congestion at the intersection of Anderson Street and Redlands Boulevard and noted that eastbound Redlands Boulevard traffic turning north on Anderson Street blocked the intersection, thus causing gridlock. He requested enforcement and ticketing of offenders.

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

City Clerk

City of Loma Linda

City Council Minutes

Regular Meeting of March 14, 2006

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

A regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Petersen at 6:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 14, 2006, in the City Council Chamber, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Councilmen Present:

Mayor Floyd Petersen
Mayor pro tempore Stan Brauer
Robert Ziprick
Charles Umeda

Councilman Absent:

Councilman Robert Christman

Others Present:

City Manager Dennis R. Halloway
City Attorney Richard E. Holdaway

Closed Session

CC-2006-043 – Conference with Labor Negotiator Dennis R. Halloway pertaining to Meet and Confer Process relating to San Bernardino Public Employees Association; Professional and Administrative Employees Association; Loma Linda Firefighters Local 3603; and Unrepresented Employees (Government Code Section 54957.6)

The City Council immediately recessed to consider the closed session item as listed and reconvened at 7:03 p.m. with all members present, except Councilman Christman. City Attorney Holdaway stated that the closed session related to the meet and confer process and that there was no final action to report.

Mayor Petersen led the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. No items were added or deleted.

Oral Reports/Public Participation

Leland Lubinsky, 25818 Redlands Boulevard, commented on the Draft General Plan, geographic inequity of appointed committee members, and the State of California Governor's Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines.

Scheduled and Related Items

CC-2006-044 – Presentation by SANBAG regarding the I-10/Tippecanoe/Anderson Street Interchange

Darrell Kettle, Director of Freeway Construction for SANBAG addressed the City Council, stating that the partners for the project were: SANBAG, Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans, City of Loma Linda, City of San Bernardino, Loma Linda University Medical Center, and the Inland Valley Development Agency.

He then presented a project overview, noting that:

- 1) The environmental document would include numerous studies, such as traffic, air quality, endangered species/wildlife, cultural resources and business/housing right-of-way impacts.
- 2) It was anticipated that construction could begin within two to five years.
- 3) Significant funding was available, but details were still pending.
- 4) The Interchange Phase would include improvements to Tippecanoe/Anderson interchange and nearby streets; synchronization of traffic signals on Tippecanoe for improved flow; widening of Tippecanoe/Redlands Boulevard intersection to three lanes in each direction; and minor local street adjustments for new ramps
- 5) SANBAG advocated an option that would include a design-build process rather than the traditional design-bid-build process that would expedite project delivery, but would require approval by the State Legislature. Assemblyman Emmerson had authored AB 2604 for design-build for the interchange.
- 6) The Interchange Phase was scheduled so that the environmental document would be completed by spring 2008; plans, specifications, and estimates for a design-bid-build process to be completed by the end of 2009; completion of right-of-way by 2009/2010; construction advertising in mid-2010; construction beginning by late 2010 and ending by early 2013.
- 7) Cost estimates included right-of-way acquisition of \$15 million; construction of \$20 million with funding provided by Federal Demonstration funds and new federal transportation act (SAFETEA-LU), local development match of 20 percent, and state funds.
- 8) The Evans Street Phase included a new north-south corridor from Redlands Boulevard to the UPRR tracks, approximately one-third mile west of Anderson Street and an east-west tie-in to Anderson Street that would offer alternate access to Loma Linda Academy and the Anderson Street/Redlands Boulevard intersection.
- 9) The Evans Street Phase would be the first step toward future extension of Evans to Barton Road as included in the City's General Plan.
- 10) The Evans Street environmental clearance was expected by the end of 2006.

11) A traditional design-bid-build method was proposed with plans, specifications, and estimates to be completed by the fall of 2007; construction to begin by the spring of 2008 and completion anticipated by mid-2009.

12) Evans Street right-of-way acquisition was anticipated to cost \$5 million and construction \$10 million with funding provided by Federal Demonstration funds and local development match of 20 percent.

13) Needs of the stakeholders included: access to hospital and commercial centers; improvements to local traffic; emergency access, employee/student access via freeways and local streets; improved operations on I-10 mainline and ramps.

14) Legislative approval was required to proceed with the design-build phase.

A question-and-answer period followed.

CC-2006-045

CRA-2006-15 - Joint Public Hearing of the City Council and Redevelopment Agency to consider the disposition and development of property known as 25371 Park Avenue, including an agreement between the Agency and Habitat for Humanity, San Bernardino Area, Inc., developer (To be continued to April 18)

- a. CRA Bill #R-2006-06 - Approving an Affordable Housing Agreement
- b. Council Bill #R-2006-12 - Consenting to the Affordable Housing Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency and Habitat for Humanity

The Agency Board convened at 7:52 p.m. with all members present except Board Member Christman. Mayor Petersen opened the public hearing, and asked for testimony from anyone who could not attend the April 18 meeting. No public testimony was offered.

Motion by Brauer, seconded by Umeda and carried to continue the public hearing to April 18. Christman absent.

CC-2006-046

CRA-2006-16 - Joint Public Hearing of the City Council and Redevelopment Agency regarding the sale of property known as APN 0293-021-19, west of the abandoned portion of Main Street in Bryn Mawr, to the La Loma Credit Union

- a. CRA Bill #R-2006-07 - Approving the Disposition and Development Agreement
- b. Council Bill #R-2006-13 - Consenting to the Disposition and Development Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency and the La Loma Credit Union

Mayor Petersen opened the public hearing and chaired the item. The City Clerk presented the report, stating that the Redevelopment Agency purchased the subject site by way of a County Tax Sale to possibly provide affordable housing. The lot was an unimproved, 3,900 square foot lot that was considered blighted and plagued with trash dumping due to its remoteness. She explained that the La Loma Federal Credit Union acquired adjacent parcels to construct a new credit union facility to replace its Anderson Street operation and offered to purchase the subject parcel to enhance its development. The price of \$14,000 was accepted. Sale of the site and improvements would be privately financed and would benefit the area through on-going elimination of blight. Use of the net sales proceeds would assist the Agency's efforts to implement the Redevelopment Plan by providing low-to-moderate income housing in another area. She confirmed that the CC&R's would allow the Site to be developed pursuant to local land use regulations and in a manner complementary to the development of the adjacent property owned by the Credit Union. The sale of the site was not less than the fair re-use value.

Todd Murdock, President of the Credit Union, addressed the City Council and Agency Board, stating that acquisition of the subject parcel would be advantageous to the development to address grading and parking issues. He then displayed a map of the site as well as a rendering of the credit union building, and responded to questions. No other public testimony was offered and the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to adopt CRA Bill #R-2007-07. Councilman Christman absent.

Resolution No. 260

A Resolution of the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency approving a Disposition and Development Agreement by and between the Agency and the La Loma Federal Credit Union

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2006-07. Councilman Christman absent.

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Resolution No. 2438

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda consenting to the approval by the Loma Linda Redevelopment Agency approving a Disposition and Development Agreement by and between the Agency and the La Loma Federal Credit Union

The Agency Board recessed to allow completion of the City Council Agenda.

New Business

CC-2006-047 – Council Bill #r-2006-14 – Adopting policies in connection with conduit bond issues and related hearings

Special Counsel Huebsch of Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth addressed the City Council, stating that the proposed policies related to conduit bond issues, which were those bonds not issued for the City's or Agency's purposes, but issued under IRS Code for the benefit of private parties under certain circumstances. The subject proposal was reviewed by Alan Miller, Financial Advisor to the City and Agency. He then suggested that policies be adopted so that should the City be called upon to be the issuer, the policies would provide the procedure and clear point of reference. He then responded to questions.

Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to adopt Council Bill #R-2006-14. Councilman Christman absent.

Resolution No. 2439

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Loma Linda adopting policies in connection with conduit issues of bonds and related hearings

CC-2006-048 – Consent Calendar

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to approve the following items:

The Demands Register dated February 28, 2006 with commercial demands totaling \$22,615.64.

The Demands Register dated February 28, 2006 with commercial demands totaling \$60,057.58,

The Demands Register dated March 14, 2006 with commercial demands totaling \$538,502.50 and payroll demands totaling \$197,950.31.

The February 2006 Treasurer's Report for filing.

Award of contract to CDM of Irvine in the amount of \$30,000 to prepare a Water and Sanitary Sewer Rate Study.

Award of contract to Engineering Resources of Southern California, Inc. in the amount of \$27,000 to prepare the Urban Water Management Plan.

Award of contract to Goodman and Associates of Colton in the amount of \$16,180 to design storm drain improvements on Barton Road between Benton Street and Richardson Street.

Accepted with regret the resignation of Kenneth Hunt from the Traffic Advisory Committee; declared a vacancy; and directed the Clerk to post a Special Vacancy Notice.

New Business (Continued)

CC-2006-49 – Approximately 8.82 acres on the east side of Poplar Street, south of San Timoteo Creek

- a. Mitigated Negative Declaration (Adopt)
- b. Council Bill #O-2006-02 (First Reading/Set the Public Hearing for March 28) – Zone Change No. 06-01 from Multiple Family Residence (R-3) to Planned Community (PC)
- c. Tentative Parcel Map No. 06-01 to reconfigure the existing 27 lots into three(3) parcels (Set the Public Hearing for March 28)
- d. Conditional Use Permit No. 06-01 for a 44-unit, three-story affordable housing apartment building; 25 affordable condominiums and 37 single-family market homes (Set the Public Hearing for March 28)

Assistant Planner Colunga presented the report, stating that the applicant proposed to create three lots from 27 existing lots; the Historical Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish six houses; the entire site was currently owned by the Redevelopment Agency; the land was proposed to be cleared by the Agency and transferred to the applicant, with the exception of the apartment parcel, which would be leased to the applicant for a period of time. He stated that further subdivision of the parcels for the condominiums and single-family detached units would be required.

He reviewed the various housing types, noting that the apartments were proposed to have one to four bedroom units within a 35-foot, three-story building with subterranean parking; on-site managers office, clubhouse, and would be a gated community. A half-court basketball court was proposed as well as a community garden, barbecues, and guest parking. The apartment parcel would also have access to the San Timoteo Creek Trail

He explained that the Planning Commission recommended approval of a change of zoning from R-3 to Planned Community as well as approval of the Parcel Map for the creation of three lots. The CUP was recommended for approval for the apartments only. The Planning Commission approved the houses and condominiums in concept only, with the design of the condominiums and houses to be re-submitted to the Planning Commission. He noted that a precise plan of design would address the concerns of the Planning Commission; that the applicant would be working with its architect to redesign the for-sale products.

Mr. Colunga noted that the condominiums were two-story units with two-car garages; would face Poplar Street; be gated and would share in the HOA with the single-family detached product. The single-family houses were proposed to be one and two-stories in a gated community. Recreation amenities included a swimming pool, community room and barbecues to be shared with the condominiums. The interior streets would be private.

He then recommended adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness; continuance of the Zone Change, Tentative Parcel Map, and Conditional Use Permit to March 28 at which time the items would be subject to a public hearing.

Mayor pro tempore Brauer commented that houses and parcels on Poplar Street had a reputation of non-maintenance; that the Agency worked diligently toward a goal that would benefit those living in the area and the City as a community. He noted that a half basketball court was better than a full court for local recreation. He also asked that the HOA maintain the front yards to the front façade and that the area be included in the Landscape Maintenance District so that should maintenance to the satisfaction of the City not occur, the City could provide property maintenance through the LMD.

Councilman Umeda commended Corporation for Better Housing for their cooperation in responding to requests of the Executive Committee, such as one- and two-story single-family houses and subterranean parking in order to provide more open space. He noted that the site was difficult to plan because of the San Timoteo Creek influence and also noted the acquisition effort of staff in order to provide adequate land for a quality product. Councilman Ziprick concurred.

Mayor Petersen commented on the time and effort it has taken thus far in order to submit a proposal to the City Council.

Mary Silverstein, Executive Vice President of Corporation for Better Housing, applicant, complimented City Staff for their thoroughness and genuine care for the community. She then showed slides and displayed renderings of the proposed 106-unit project including the housing types, recreational amenities, and landscaping plan, elaborating on the plans and amenities for each housing type. She also stated that each housing product promoted a healthy life style in the recreation opportunities provided, including access to the walking/jogging trail along San Timoteo Creek. She elaborated that the Connected Community Program would be available to all housing types within the development. Security could also be provided through the Connected Community Program. She noted that Corporation for Better Housing partnered with community service providers to enhance opportunities for the residents, such as after school programs, computer center, library connectivity similar to bookmobile services, and other programs for all ages. She then responded to questions.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and approve the Certificate of Appropriateness. Councilman Christman absent.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Brauer and carried to introduce Council Bill #O-2006-02 on First Reading and to set the public hearing for March 28. Councilman Christman absent.

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to set the public hearing for Tentative Parcel Map No. 06-01 for March 28. Councilman Christman absent.

PENDING CITY
COUNCIL APPROVAL

Motion by Umeda, seconded by Ziprick and carried to set the public hearing for Conditional Use Permit No. 06-01 for March 28. Councilman Christman absent.

CC-2006-049 – Establish an 11-member ad hoc committee for the design and development of the Redlands Boulevard Landscape Median from Mt. View Avenue westerly to the City Limits

Director of Public Works Thaipetr presented his report, stating that in January 2005, City Council awarded a contract for the design of a median on Redlands Boulevard; an element of the design process was to seek community input to garner consensus and support for the project. An ad hoc committee for special projects such as this one would accomplish that. He then recommended that the ad hoc committee be comprised of four business representatives from Redlands Boulevard, three from the Chamber of Commerce, two from the Parks, Recreation, Beautification Committee and two from the community at large in order to glean a wide range of experience for the committee and to provide a good cross section of those affected by the project.

[Mayor pro tempore Brauer left at 8:47 p.m.]

Councilman Umeda added that establishment of the ad hoc committee would be beneficial to assist in the resolution of issues relating to access to businesses. Councilman Ziprick recommended an open application period.

By common consent, establishment of an 11-member ad hoc committee with membership as recommended by Staff was approved. Councilman Christman absent.

CC-2006-050 – Request for support of Assembly Bill No. 2572

Councilman Ziprick presented background for AB 2472, stating that Assemblyman Emmerson proposed the bill to allow cities with universities having student dormitories to count student dormitories that were identified within the Housing Element of a city or county general plan for purposes of determining whether the city or county met its share of regional housing needs. He then asked the City Council to support AB 2572.

[Mayor pro tempore Brauer returned at 8:51 p.m.]

Councilman Umeda added that State mandates of the Regional Housing Allocation requires cities and counties to meet certain housing requirements; the most recent allocation for the City was 1,512 homes; another allocation was scheduled for 2007. It was important for Loma Linda to be able to count dormitories, even though temporary housing, toward meeting its allocation.

Motion by Ziprick, seconded by Umeda and carried to support Assembly Bill 2572. Councilman Christman absent.

Reports of Councilmen

Mayor pro tempore Brauer stated that signs were being placed within rights-of-way and asked for sign enforcement. City Attorney Holdaway responded that the Municipal Code provided for enforcing such situations by Administrative Citation.

Mayor Petersen commented on the workshop with committee/commission members regarding the South Hills, noting that it was well attended and very helpful.

Councilman Ziprick also commented and stated that Staff would compile the comments for presentation to the City Council at a future meeting. He also stated that he attended a peak oil workshop, noting that once the peak was reached, there would be a decline in oil production that would affect several countries. Means of producing energy, other than oil and coal needed to be explored because it was anticipated that the coal supply would be depleted within 200 years and the supply of oil depleted even sooner.

Councilman Umeda noted that with the oil shortage, lifestyles would change, including transportation and commuting. Communities needed to be designed so people who work could live close to their employment centers; also alternative energy resources to heat and cool houses were necessary to conserve and preserve other energy resources.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of

City Clerk